



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,151	09/29/2003	Clifford H. Kraft		1913

7590 06/21/2006
Clifford Kraft
320 Robin Hill Dr.
Naperville, IL 60540

EXAMINER

BEAULIEU, YONEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,151	Applicant(s) KRAFT ET AL.	
	Examiner Yonel Beaulieu	Art Unit 3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/27/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Bruce et al. (U.S. '998 B2) fails to teach displaying of construction information in the vehicle. As an initial matter, such is not claimed to the extent argued in at least claim 21. Claim 21 only calls for displaying such an information and not necessarily in a vehicle environment per se. Second, it is the Examiner's position Bruce does support what is claimed, i.e., "in-vehicle" display of navigational information including but not limited to construction information, when col. 1, lines 35 – 47 and col. 9, lines 21 – 51 are considered.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

As to the combination of the references (Bruce '998 with Desai '509), obviousness may be based upon a combination of prior art references where the motivation to combine is either a teaching or suggestion in an individual reference of the proposed combination or in the prior art references as a whole, or in the knowledge generally available to those skilled in the art. Also, the motivation to combine references need not be identical to that of the Applicant to establish obviousness. One needs to look at what the combination suggests to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention.

In view of the above, it is believed the rejection is proper. The rejection is therefore maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 9 – 12, 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruce et al. (US 6,765,998 B2).

Regarding claim 9, Bruce et al. teaches providing road construction information to vehicle on-board telematics systems comprising at least one vehicle telemetric system displaying map information (col. 1, lines 18 – 48; col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 18 at least); a central information gathering location for gathering road construction information for vehicle routes supplied by an agency (14) and providing such information to the telematics system from the central location and displaying the information along with the map information (col. 9, lines 21 – 57 at least).

Regarding claims 10 – 12, Bruce et al.'s system is wireless and uses wireless means that is a cellular telephone in a local area network (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 52 – 65; col. 5, lines 61 – 67; col. 6, line 66 – col. 4 and col. 8, lines 42 – 64 at least).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Bruce et al. charges a fee for the information (element 12 is a subscriber which inherently receives service for a fee; col. 3, lines 18 – 24, 47 – 49; and col. 4, lines 54 – 59 at least).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 14, and 17 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruce et al. ('998) in view of Desai et al. (US 5,862,509).

As discussed above, Bruce teaches all of the limitations except for the information containing information of affected lanes and times.

However, Desai teaches, in the same field of endeavor of system providing road construction information, information which contains information on affected lanes and times (col. 3, line 44 – col. 4, line 13 and col. 8, lines 58 – 67 at least).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the times of the invention to have modified Bruce's teaching by including information containing information of affected lanes and times as evidenced by Desai in order to optimize trip planning.

Conclusion


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yonel Beaulieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-6955. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Wed. and Thurs. between 0900 and 1600.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yonel Beaulieu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661